



"Lavoie, Sondra N."
<SNLavoie@isecinc.com>

01/30/2006 10:50 AM

To: <AirportEIR@longbeach.gov>, <district1@longbeach.gov>, <district2@longbeach.gov>, <district3@longbeach.gov>, <district4@longbeach.gov>, <district5@longbeach.gov>, <district6@longbeach.gov>, <district7@longbeach.gov>, <district8@longbeach.gov>, <district9@longbeach.gov>, <mayor@longbeach.gov>

cc:

Subject: QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS TO AIRPORT DRAFT EIR

Dear Ms. Reynolds

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a response to the Airport Terminal Draft EIR. I am expecting that my comments will be read and addressed. When I and by what method, can expect to hear specific responses to my comments below? If the City is not responding to public comments, why is that?

1

The Draft EIR's conclusion that, all things being equal, the Proposed Project, a 103,000 square foot terminal building "is the environmentally superior alternative" is not consistent with LEED guidelines. According to USGBC LEED criteria, the larger a building is, the more materials it requires to build, the more energy it requires to light, the more energy it requires to air condition, the more energy it requires to heat, more chemicals it requires to maintain, and it creates more heat source in an urban landscape. Furthermore the alternative relying on the development presently undeveloped of Parcel "O" which is now open space is not environmentally superior. The DEIR cannot and does not adequately support the statement that the largest alternative is environmentally superior. According to LEED principals, the larger building would be the environmentally inferior alternative.

2

Noise evaluations in this Draft report are very problematic and disturbing confusing to the public. Residents have just recently learned that the noise calculations for the Noise Ordinance disregard the high level of noise when a jet is taking off and landing, when wheels are on the ground. Shouldn't full public disclosure require that ALL the airport noise impacting the surrounding community must be disclosed? Should the public disclosure include ALL the noise from life-flight, helicopter flight paths, military and any other aviation noise that may be disregarded in the budgets for the Noise Ordinance? Policy makers and the public must have a comprehensive data of all the noise exposure.

3

It is imperative that the noise contour diagrams show ALL the present and expected noise impacts from every source of aviation noise. This must be done in clear, accurate and thorough terms so the public can understand the noise exposure. If you have to temporarily set up noise monitors over helicopter paths and other locations, then you must do that in order to achieve the required full-public disclosure. Flights wake people up at all hours of the night and sleep disruption is a negative impact that exceeds mere "annoyance."

4

The proposed parking structure to accommodate passengers driving single accompany vehicles to and from the airport is also an environmentally inferior alternative. Why didn't the consultant consider alternatives like incentives for vanpools, car pools and high occupancy vehicles? Isn't an enlarged, overbuilt parking structure an invitation to bring in more flights to Long Beach Airport? Isn't an overbuilt airport with excess capacity an invitation to bring more flights into Long Beach.

5

HNTB's 2004 study recommending an even larger terminal building shows bias. Why did you not mention the hundreds of hours of public testimony that the residents do not want a larger airport terminal

at Long Beach. Why did you not state that Airport paid HNTB, and the residential concerns were ignored by that consultant because the Airport Management wants the biggest terminal? City Council approved the smaller size options for purposes of this study. If the EIR discusses HNTB's recommendations as relevant, then the consultant must include the residents comments, those who are already impacted and at risk of airport expansion?

5 cont.

It is unacceptable that the Draft EIR failed to include air quality data of actual air sampling taken at, near and around the airport property. In public scoping meetings, there was an overwhelming public demand for actual air sampling. The only existing air collection point is many blocks upwind of the airport. When a jet runs up it engines at take off, jet exhaust levels are extremely high and toxic to humans. These emissions are windblown directly into residential neighborhoods. Meanwhile the air collection station is upwind! A single collection point upwind of the runway is unacceptable to evaluate the emissions and health risk to thousands of Long Beach residents whose homes surround the airport. Residents are legally entitled to know the cumulative negative impact associated with the ports pollution and the 710 corridor for the movement of goods AND THE AIRPORT. If you plan to ignore this request, tell me why and what legal grounds you have to ignore this in an EIR? Aircraft still use lead-based additives in aviation fuel. Lead exposure is very hazardous to humans. Why is this not discussed and disclosed?

6

Economic growth as a criteria for Long Beach Airport Terminal Improvements is unacceptable. Why haven't you included the fact that there has never been an unbiased study of the airport which includes negative economic impact to Long Beach Neighborhoods? The Airport paid for an economic study last year, but they did not allow anyone from the public on the oversight committee to consider even a single negative economic impact? Jets flying over residential neighborhoods has significant negative economic impacts that must be disclosed to the public and policy makers. Also, why have you included economic growth for an entire airport property, when the project is only supposed to be about terminal improvements? The public has been told that improvements will not generate more flights or more passengers, so where is the logic that the project supports significant economic growth for Long Beach?

7

Sincerely,

Sondra Lavoie
6567 Walnut Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90805
solowwon@msn.com

COMMENTS 288 SONDRA N. LAVOIE
Dated: January 30, 2006

Response 1

Your comments are noted and have been forwarded to the decision makers as part of the Final EIR submittal. Responses to all of the comments received on the Draft EIR are provided in the Responses to Comments document.

Response 2

There is a commitment to construct the new facilities to meet high standards for energy efficiency and environmental design. The intention is to construct the facilities consistent with the LEED standards. LEED, which stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design is 'based on well-founded scientific standards, LEED standards emphasizes state of the art strategies for sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection and indoor environmental quality. LEED standards recognizes achievements and promotes expertise in green building through a comprehensive system offering project certification, professional accreditation, training and practical resources.' (U.S. Green Building Council, <http://www.usgbc.org>). This would be implemented through a variety of design features. Precise methods for accomplishing the LEED standards would be determined through project design.

It is recognized that construction of facilities in excess of what is required to serve the demand would not be efficient; however, it is also necessary to provide sufficient facilities to serve the demand. Construction of terminal improvements that would not serve the demand and necessitate other improvements or use of temporary modular buildings, similar to existing conditions, would not be environmentally superior. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page 1-25),

...based on the *Facility Requirements Analysis, Long Beach Municipal Airport*⁷³ study which was prepared during the scoping process, the recommended sizes of the facilities to best meet the needs for the passengers, visitors, and tenants actually exceeded the square footage allocation of even the Proposed Project.

Refer to Topical Response 3.1.4 regarding the environmentally superior alternative.

Response 3

Refer to Topical Response 3.1.6, Nighttime Noise Violation Review Process, regarding the types of operations that are, by federal law, exempted from complying with the City's noise limits/curfew.

Response 4

The number of parking spaces required was calculated from a professional parking study entitled "Long Beach Airport Parking Adequacy Analysis", which was conducted for the City in 2001. The study showed a need for 2.75 parking spaces for each 1,000 annual enplanements. Currently, during peak travel periods the existing parking structure at the Airport is full. This results in vehicles driving around looking for parking and needing to go out to the remote lot (Lot D). If sufficient parking were not provided, there would be an increase in the number of passenger drop-off and pick-up trips because some of the passengers would have no other option but to be dropped off, increasing the overall amount of traffic at the airport. In addition to

⁷³ HNTB 2004.

increasing the overall amount of traffic at the Airport, this would also result in greater air quality impacts. Therefore, the DEIR's conclusion that additional parking is an integral part of the environmentally superior alternative is accurate.

Response 5

All of the public testimony that was given at public meetings on November 29, December 3, December 5, and December 15, 2005 is provided in the Responses to Comments document dated April 24, 2006. These meetings, which were held after the release of the Draft EIR, constitute all of the official public meetings on the Draft EIR. It should be noted that after the original Notice of Preparation for the proposed project was released, the Airport Advisory Commission (AAC) held a series of 15 public meetings between November 2003 and July 2004 at which the proposed project was discussed. Though not part of the formal scoping process, the AAC used these meetings to consider the public's recommendations regarding possible Airport improvements. The AAC's recommendations were then forwarded to the City Council which, on February 8, 2005, directed the DEIR consultant team not to carry forward AAC's recommended facility size, opting instead for a smaller (102,850 square feet) proposed project. Each of the project alternatives that is evaluated in the DEIR is smaller than the proposed project.

Response 6

Please see Topical Response 3.1.5, Methodology for the Air Quality Impact Analysis and Human Health Risk Assessment, regarding air sampling data near the Airport.

Regarding lead emissions, the emissions inventory does include lead emissions from piston-driven aircraft fueled on leaded aviation gasoline, as noted in the Draft EIR, Appendix C, Section 3.1.1.4. Lead emissions are summarized in Table 3-8 of Appendix C. Concentrations of lead are included in the Draft EIR, Section 3.2, Tables 3.2-13, 3.2-17, and 3.2-20. These lead concentrations do not exceed any significance thresholds or ambient air quality standards.

Quantitative analysis of any cumulative impacts of future projects at the Ports of LA and Long Beach and the 710 Freeway expansion are beyond the scope of this Draft EIR. The City has no way of knowing if and when such projects will be undertaken and what the timing and scope of the projects, if approved, might be. Any such projects conducted in the future would be subject to CEQA and would have to account for cumulative impacts, including those associated with airport improvement. Only at such time would sufficient information be available to assess potential cumulative health risks.

Response 7

Your comments are noted and have been forwarded to the decision makers as part of the Final EIR submittal. The fiscal considerations of the project are not a topic pursuant to CEQA. The EIR addresses potential physical impacts.